

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 remain pending and under current examination. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in light of the following remarks.

In the Office Action¹, the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,571,234 by Knight et al. ("*Knight*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections for the following reasons.

I. The rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Knight* is improper.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by *Knight*. In order to properly establish that *Knight* anticipates Applicant's claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every element of each of the claims in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in that single reference. Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." See M.P.E.P. § 2131, quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Knight does not disclose each and every element of Applicant's claimed invention. Claim 1 calls for a combination including, for example,

access control means for making user authentication of a client terminal as an access request source so as to permit the client terminal to post a message; and ...

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

message moving means for moving the categorized and accumulated messages between the virtual communities in accordance with an instruction from an administrator.

The Examiner asserts that “Knight teaches access control means for making user authentication to permit posting of messages, col. 9, lines 5-7 as ‘fees or usage’, col. 28, lines 5-7 and ‘authorized members’, col. 12, lines 40-41” (Office Action at p. 2).

However, the cited portions do not teach “access control means for making user authentication of a client terminal as an access request source so as to permit the client terminal to post a message,” as recited by claim 1.

Also with respect to claim 1, the Examiner asserts that “Knight teaches ... message moving means between communities, col. 10, lines 15-19 in accord with administrator instructions, col. 18, lines 66-67 and as ‘rules’, etc., col. 9, lines 35-39” (Office Action at p. 2). However, the cited portions of *Knight* merely discuss a removing process (*Knight*, col. 10, line 18). This does not constitute a teaching of “message moving means for moving the categorized and accumulated messages between the virtual communities in accordance with an instruction from an administrator,” as recited by claim 1.

Because *Knight* fails to teach each and every element recited by claim 1 and required by dependent claims 2-5, *Knight* cannot anticipate these claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Knight*.

Further, dependent claim 2 recites a combination including, for example, “messages in at least one source virtual community designated by the administrator are

batch-moved to a destination virtual community designated by the administrator, and the at least one source community is then deleted to combine the virtual communities.”

The Examiner asserts that “Knight teaches all messages in a virtual community are batch moved as ‘indexes’, col. 10, lines 44-48 and ‘tags’, col. 12, lines 16-18 which includes deleting or ‘removing’ communities, col. 17, lines 6-7” (Office Action at p. 2). However, *Knight* merely discloses in col. 10, lines 44-45 “indexes 261 are ... created,” in col. 12, lines 16-18 that “each posting is ... tagged with one or more additional parameter field(s) specifying one or more categories which such posting should fall under,” and in col. 17, lines 6-7 that an option to “Remove from Favorites: remove[] the currently selected group from the Custom query parameter menu” is available. Such teachings do not constitute a teaching that “messages ... are batch-moved to a destination virtual community,” as recited by claim 2. Moreover, such teachings do not constitute a teaching that a “community is ... deleted to combine the virtual communities,” as recited by claim 2.

Further, dependent claim 3 recites a combination including, for example, “means for updating the community management information ... after batch movement of messages by said message moving means.” The Examiner asserts that “Knight teaches ... means for updating community information after batch moves, col. 26, lines 40-49” (Office Action at p. 3). However, the cited portion of *Knight* does not teach “batch movement,” or “means for updating the community management information ... after batch movement of messages by said message moving means,” as recited by claim 3.

Further, dependent claim 4 recites a combination including, for example, “message moving means moves some of messages in the source virtual community designated by the administrator to at least one new virtual community created by the administrator so as to divide the virtual community.” The Examiner asserts that “Knight teaches message moving means to move some messages so as to divide the community, col. 10, lines 6-8, 19” (Office Action at p. 3). However, the cited portion fails to teach “message moving means moves some of messages in the source virtual community designated by the administrator to at least one new virtual community created by the administrator so as to divide the virtual community,” as recited by claim 4.

Further, dependent claim 5 recites a combination including, for example,

a community table for storing community data associated with virtual communities, and a thread table for storing thread data associated with threads as sets of messages posted to the virtual communities,

said message moving means comprises:

means for searching the community table and the thread table in response to an instruction from a client terminal of an administrator, and sending community data managed by the administrator and corresponding thread data to the client terminal of the administrator;

means for receiving thread movement data, which designates source and destination communities, and some or all thread data of the source community, which are input at the client terminal of the administrator.

The Examiner asserts that “Knight teaches a community table as ‘menus’, col. 11, line 29” (Office Action at p. 3). However, the menus of *Knight* do not constitute a teaching or suggestion of “a community table for storing community data associated with virtual communities,” as recited by claim 5.

Also with respect to dependent claim 5, the Examiner asserts that “Knight teaches ... a thread table as sets of messages as ‘processing’, col. 10 lines 54-57 for searching the community table, col. 11, lines 27-30 and sending community data, col. 16, lines 9-13” (Office Action at p. 3). Even assuming these assertions are true, *Knight* fails to teach or suggest at least “message moving means” comprising “means for searching the community table and the thread table in response to an instruction from a client terminal of an administrator, and sending community data managed by the administrator and corresponding thread data to the client terminal of the administrator,” as recited by claim 5.

Also with respect to dependent claim 5, *Knight* fails to teach or suggest at least “means for receiving thread movement data, which designates source and destination communities, and some or all thread data of the source community, which are input at the client terminal of the administrator,” as recited by claim 5.

Because *Knight* fails to teach or suggest each and every element recited by claims 1-5, *Knight* cannot anticipate these claims. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Knight*.

Claims 6-10 and 11-15, although of different scope, recite elements similar to elements recited by claims 1-5. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1-5, *Knight* cannot anticipate claims 6-10 and 11-15. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 6-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Knight*.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 11, 2005

By: Nathan A. Sloan
Nathan A. Sloan
Reg. No. 56,249